

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed February 1, 2007, claims 6-7 and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph; claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,327,603); claims 1-3 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oh (U.S. Patent No. 5,950,460) and under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Na et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,865,046); claims 4-8 and 12-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Na et al. and further in view of Seo (U.S. Patent No. 5,551,262); and claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oh in view of Na et al. and further in view of Cho (U.S. Patent No. 5,727,404).

Claim 5 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended to include the features of cancelled claim 5.

Minor amendments have been made to claims 6, 8, 13 and 16. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 1-4 and 6-16 are currently pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 112 rejection of claims 6-7 and 13-15:

Claims 6 and 13 have been amended based upon the Examiner's comments at page 2 of the Office Action. Support for the claim amendments can be found at paragraph [0030] of the specification. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Regarding the 102(b) and 103(a) rejection of the claims:

None of the foregoing references, individually or combined, discuss "a guide unit to guide the pulsator" as recited in amended claim 1, for example. Claim 9 has been amended to recite features somewhat similar to those recited in amended claim 1.

In contrast, Roh et al. merely discusses a drum type washing machine having a washing drum including a pulsator, the pulsator disposed on its inner bottom, and being rotatable through an angle of 90 ° between vertical and horizontal positions (see column 2, lines 45-51, for example).

Oh et al. discusses a washing machine having an agitator (see FIGS. 2 and 3, for example). The washing machine includes a washing tub of which a bottom surface thereof protrudes axially and inwardly like a pyramid, the washing tub has two slanted portions which slant upwardly from an edge of the bottom surface toward an inside central axis of the washing tub (see Abstract and column 2, lines 35-42, for example). Oh et al. further includes an agitator

30 and four stirring blades 34 installed on four slanted portions rotate integrally with driven wheels 33 (see FIG. 2, for example). That is, like Roh et al., Oh et al. also fails to discuss “a guide unit to guide the pulsator”, as recited in amended claim 1, for example.

Further, Na et al. merely discusses a clothes washer having a pulsator, the pulsator disposed above a bottom portion of the clothes basket and rotated by a motor and a driving gear wheel provided rotatably in a first pulsator (see Abstract and FIG. 1, for example). Like both Roh et al. and Oh et al., Na also fails to discuss the Applicants “guide unit” as recited in claim 1, for example.

Therefore, based upon the comments mentioned above, the combination of Oh et al and Na et al. fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness over the present invention.

Further, the Applicants respectfully submit that neither Seo nor Cho make up for the deficiencies of Oh et al. and Na et al.

In contrast, Seo merely discusses a power transmission apparatus of a washing machine. The washing machine includes a spin-drying tub rotatable about an axis, and a pulsator disposed in the tub and movable relative thereto to agitate water therein (see FIGS. 1 and 4, for example).

Further, Cho merely discusses a washing machine having a double pulsator, an outer pulsator 400 being mounted on a bottom of a washing tub and an inner pulsator 300 being installed inside a protruding part (see column 2, lines 30-45 and FIG. 2, for example).

Based upon the above comments, all combinations of the above mentioned references, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness over the present invention.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or discuss all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See M.P.E.P. § 2142.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 4/26/2007

By: 

Deidre M. Davis

Registration No. 52,797

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501